



## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
Global Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/035,880	12/26/2001	Guy Tailleur	522-1770	4318

7540

06/04/2004

William M. Lee Jr.  
LEE, MANN, SMITH, MCWILLIAMS, SWEENEY & OHLSON  
P.O. Box 2786  
Chicago, IL 60690-2786

EXAMINER

ORTIZ, ANGELA Y

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1732

DATE MAILED: 06/04/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/035,880	TAILLIEU, GUY	
Examiner	Art Unit	
Angela Ortiz	1732	

- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address -

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 December 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 9-12 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 6-8 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 2-5 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 26 December 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-945)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Election/Restrictions*

Applicant's election of claims 1-8 in Paper dated 19 March 2004 is acknowledged. Because applicant did not distinctly and specifically point out the supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election has been treated as an election without traverse (MPEP § 818.03(a)).

Claims 9-18 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected invention, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made **without** traverse in Paper dated 19 March 2004.

### *Specification*

The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed.

The words "AND INSTALLATION" should be deleted from the title.

The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: within the specification, the use of "cove 21" is used; is —core— or —cover—intended?

Appropriate correction is required.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 1, 6-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cope, USP 5,508,103 in view of EP 0 852 997 A1.

The cited primary reference substantially teaches the basic claimed process of molding a relief pattern on an elongated member. The method comprises the steps of preparing a profile from an extrudable material, shaping the profile using a shaper, embossing the profile using a heated embosser while the profile still retains heat from molding. During shaping, the temperature is controlled using jacketing means, to maintain the profile temperature within the desirable parameters that affect the properties of the resulting product. See col. 3, lines 57-67; col. 4, lines 10-45, 60-65; col. 5, lines 46-53.

The cited primary reference does not set forth the instant claimed features of measuring a structural defect and controlling the heat in response to the measurement.

The added secondary reference teaches as conventional the feature of forming ornamented plastic articles by extruding plastics material and then hot stamping the extruded profile and forming a relief decoration thereon, wherein control means are provided to control the temperature of the molding means. The reference further teaches that the temperature parameters are selected to avoid damage to the molding. See col. 3, lines 1-25; claim 5.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide temperature control means, and to operate such within a desirable temperature range as shown in the added reference, when performing the process set forth in the primary reference, to better achieve a decorated profile without defect.

With respect to claims 6-8, note that the heating means disclosed in the applied prior art is readable on the claimed heating features; also note that in the primary reference, the shaper heats all sides of the profile. See col. 4, lines 24-30.

#### ***Allowable Subject Matter***

Claims 2-5 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Art Unit: 1732

**Conclusion**

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. USP's 2368085; 2404073; 4156389; 4340554; 4379102; 4584150; 4883690; 5571598; 5723199; 5882569; 6379597; EP 731 759; EP 723 845.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Angela Ortiz whose telephone number is 571-272-1206. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday 9:00-6:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Colaanni can be reached on 571-272-1196. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

  
Angela Ortiz  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 1732